

### **REMARKS**

Claims 4-9, 19, 20 and 23 are now pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 6 and 9 have been amended. Bases for the amendments can be found throughout the application, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been presented.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted the afternoon of Thursday, December 8, 2005 in which the Examiner and the undersigned attorney were the sole participants. Claim 4 was discussed and the Examiner suggested an amendment to this claim that would address the claim objections.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **CLAIM AMENDMENTS & CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Office has objected to Claims 4 through 9 for various informalities. More specifically, the Office has stated that the components of the second yoke required for the connection to the first yoke are essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claims. In the above-referenced telephonic interview, the Examiner noted that the Applicant could overcome the objection by amending the claim to describe the manner in which the second yoke and the trunnion were coupled to one another.

Applicant has amended Claims 4 and 9 to incorporate the suggestions of the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the objection to Claims 4 through 9 has

been rendered moot. Applicant notes that Claims 5 and 6 were amended so that they were consistent with the amendment to Claim 4.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office has rejected Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2002181070A. The Office has stated that the '070 reference discloses an overmold means (21).

Applicant notes, however, that the '070 reference does not disclose an overmold means but rather an anodic oxide coating (21). As anodic oxide coatings are electrolytically deposited, rather than molded onto an article, Applicant submits that the '070 reference does not teach or suggest each element of Claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

#### **CLAIM AMENDMENTS & ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Office has indicated that Claims 19 and 20 have been allowed.


#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection and objection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections and rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for

allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 9, 2005

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael D. Zalobsky  
Reg. No. 45,512

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDZ/cr